

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 95-7291**

---

LONNIE MCDONOVAN GHOLSON,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

LIEUTENANT RICE, UMT in Building Two; MAJOR THORNE; C. E. THOMPSON, Warden; SERGEANT FLEKER; SERGEANT WILLIAMS, Caucasian Male; OFFICER CRUSHFIELD; OFFICER JACKSON, Slim, tall, redhead, male corrections officer working on 8 to 4 shift in Building Two; OFFICER JACKSON, Male, black officer on TAC Team; FAYE NEWCOMB, Corrections Officer; CORRECTIONS OFFICER TERRY, Female, black officer working on day shift; CORRECTIONS OFFICER TERRY, Female, black officer working 4 to 12 shift; CORRECTIONS OFFICER HITE, Works in Building One; SERGEANT BOYD; CORRECTIONS OFFICER FREEMAN, Works Building Two on 4 to 12; OFFICER DUFFY; OFFICER JACKSON, Middle age caucasian on TAC team,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

CORRECTIONS OFFICER ROYSTER; NURSE MONEY; CORRECTIONS OFFICER SMITH, 6 foot 3, dark skin, male officer works on 8 to 4 shift in Building Two; CORRECTIONS OFFICER SMITH, Short, black, male officer who works on 4 to 12 shift; OFFICER TERRY,

Defendants.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca B. Smith, District Judge. (CA-94-695-2)

---

Submitted: December 14, 1995                      Decided: January 17, 1996

---

Before ERVIN, Chief Judge, and WIDENER and WILKINS, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Lonnie McDonovan Gholson, Appellant Pro Se. Lance Bradford Leggitt, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals from the district court's orders denying relief on his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (1988) complaint. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Gholson v. Rice, No. CA-94-695-2 (E.D. Va. June 29, 1995; July 20, 1995). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED